

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The formal drawing Replacement Sheet attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figure 11 is being presented as a new formal drawing sheet to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheet. The drawing figure 11 has been amended. The specific changes which have been made are listed below:

**FIGURE 11:**

The reference numeral "115" for indicating the output from the test pattern generator has been deleted.

**REMARKS****Status of Claims**

Claims 1-5 were pending in the application. Claims 1-5 have been canceled and new claims 6-18 have been newly added. Therefore, claims 6-19 are pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration.

This amendment adds and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

**Drawing Objection**

Figure 11 has been amended to correct a minor informality as indicated in paragraph 1 of the Office Action. A formal drawing Replacement Sheet for figure 11 is attached hereto.

**Prior Art Rejections**

In the Office Action, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,821,238 to Tatematsu (hereafter “Tatematsu”) in view of U.S. patent application publication no. 2001/0056557 to Kawagoe et al. (hereafter “Kawagoe”), U.S. patent 4, 446,514 to Brown et al. (hereafter “Brown”) and U.S. patent 6,034,907 to Haraguchi (hereafter “Haraguchi”). Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatematsu, Kawagoe, Brown, and Haraguchi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. patent 5,987,635 to Kishi et al. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tatematsu, Kawagoe, Brown, and Haraguchi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view U.S. patent application publication no. 2003/0120974 to Adams et al. Claim 4 is rejected under Tatematsu, Kawagoe, Brown, and Haraguchi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view Japanese patent document no. 02216565. While claims 1-5 have been canceled, making these rejections moot, applicant traverses these rejections insofar as they may be applied to the presently pending claims.

Specifically, independent claim 6 recites a semiconductor device which includes, *inter alia*, “a first external terminal shared to receive serially said test pattern data and said address data.”

With respect to a similar feature in the originally filed claims, the office action acknowledged that Tatematsu did not disclose such a feature and relied on Haraguchi for this teaching. However, in Haraguchi, the terminal for inputting the write data (i.e. the data port 5) is provided separately from the terminal for inputting the test signal TP including the address data. Accordingly, Haraguchi does not disclose this feature. Neither is this deficiency cured by any of the other applied references. Accordingly, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the features recited in independent claim 6.

Independent claim 15 recites a semiconductor device in which, *inter alia*, “a first external terminal shared to receive serially said test pattern data and said selection data.” As discussed above, in Haraguchi, the data port 5 is provided separately from the terminal for inputting the test signal TP. Accordingly, this recited feature is not disclosed by Haraguchi. Furthermore, this deficiency in Tatematsu and Haraguchi is also not cured by any of the other applied references. Accordingly, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the features recited in independent claim 15.

The dependent claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims on which they depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole. For example, the features recited in claims 7, 8, and 11 are also not disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art and provides additional reasons for the patentability of these claims.

### Conclusion

In view of the above, applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers

submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 13, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5407  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

David A. Blumenthal  
Registration No. 26,257  
Aaron C. Chatterjee  
Registration No. 41,398  
Attorneys for Applicant

Attached: One (1) formal drawing Replacement Sheet for figure 11